

REMARKS

This responds to the Office Action mailed on April 24, 2006.

No claims are amended, canceled, or added; as a result, claims 1, 4, 6-8, 12-17, 19-24, 26, and 27 are now pending in this application.

§112 Rejection of the Claims

Claims 1, 8, 15, 21 and 24 were rejected under 35 USC § 112, first paragraph, as containing subject matter which was not described in the specification in such a way as to enable one skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and/or use the invention. Applicants traverse this rejection.

The specification as filed, at page 9, lines 2-3, recites “if a beacon is not received, the next wake-up time is set to one beacon interval in an attempt to receive the next beacon.” Applicants respectfully submit that this passage provides the necessary enabling description for the claim language in question.

§103 Rejection of the Claims

Claims 1, 4, 7-8, 12-17, 19-21 were rejected under 35 USC § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Bokhorst, et al. (U.S. Patent 6,192,230) in view of Romans (U.S. Patent 6,665,520).

Claims 24, 26, and 27 were rejected under 35 USC § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Bokhorst, et al. (U.S. Patent 6,192,230) in view of Romans (U.S. Patent 6,665,520). And further in view of Ciccone (U.S. Patent 6,078,819).

Claims 6, 22 and 23 were rejected under 35 USC § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Bokhorst, et al. (U.S. Patent 6,192,230) in view of Romans (U.S. Patent 6,665,520) and further in view of Lindskog, et al. (U.S. Publication No. 2001/0031626).

Applicants respectfully traverse the above rejections under 35 USC § 103(a). For each of independent claims 1, 8, and 15, the office action alleges that Bokhorst et al. teaches:

1) determining a desired sleep interval as a number of TIM intervals (see Figure 6, col. 5 line 29 to col. 6, line 9).

Regarding item (1), above, applicants respectfully submit that Bokhorst does not teach as alleged. Rather, Bokhorst teaches away from determining a sleep interval as a number of TIM intervals. For example, col. 5, lines 26-30 of Bokhorst state:

It will be appreciated that the duration of the doze interval is chosen such that the station transceiver is in the awake state prior to the earliest time that the TIM message can arrive. This ensures that no TIM message is lost due to a late switching to the awake state.

As stated by Bokhorst in the above cited portion, Bokhorst *ensures* that the station transceiver is awake for every TIM message. Accordingly, Bokhorst teach away from sleeping for a number of TIM intervals.

Further, for each of independent claims 1, 8, 15, and 24, the office action alleges that Bokhorst et al. teaches:

2) if no TIM message is received, sleeping for one additional TIM message interval (Figure 6, see 130-1, 132-1, 134-1, 136-1 indicating if there is no traffic data to be received at the mobile stations, the stations will stay asleep for one additional TIM message period; col. 5, line 17 to 62).

Regarding item (2) above, applicants respectfully submit that Bokhorst does not teach as alleged. For example, col. 5, lines 20-25 of Bokhorst state:

The receipt at the mobile stations 1 to 4 of the TIM-1 message triggers the respective doze interval timers 46 (FIG. 2) at the stations, and

causes all these stations to go to the doze state for intervals represented by the dashed line intervals 130-1, 132-1, 134-1, and 136-1.

As stated by Bokhorst in the above cited paragraph, the receipt of a TIM message *triggers* timers and *causes* the stations to doze for the cited intervals. Accordingly, Bokhorst does not set the intervals 130-1, 132-1, 134-1, and 136-1 "if no TIM message is received" as alleged in the office action. This is also shown in Figure 6 of Bokhorst where each of intervals 130-1, 132-1, 134-1, and 136-1 are shown beginning after TIM-1.

Accordingly, applicants respectfully submit that the independent claims 1, 8, 15, and 24 are in condition for allowance, and that the remaining claims are in condition for allowance at least by virtue of dependency.

Conclusion

Applicant respectfully submits that the claims are in condition for allowance and notification to that effect is earnestly requested. The Examiner is invited to telephone Applicant's attorney (952-473-8800) to facilitate prosecution of this application.

Respectfully submitted,

JIEWEN LIU ET AL.

By their Representatives,

Customer Number 45445

952-473-8800

Date June 26, 2006

By



Dana B. LeMoine
Reg. No. 40,062

CERTIFICATE UNDER 37 CFR 1.8: The undersigned hereby certifies that this correspondence is being deposited with the United States Postal Service with sufficient postage as first class mail, in an envelope addressed to: Mail Stop AF, Commissioner for Patents, P.O. Box 1450, Alexandria, VA 22313-1450, on this 26 day of 2006 June.


Kyrstin Ryan


Signature